

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in reply to the final Office Action dated June 30, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated October 15, 2008 issued in connection with the above-identified application. A request for continued examination (RCE) and a petition for a one-month extension of time accompany this Amendment. Claims 38-54 are all the claims pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 38, 43 and 48 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Applicants thank Examiner Strange for granting the Examiner Interview (hereafter "interview") conducted with the Applicants' representative on October 9, 2008. During the interview, the features of the present invention (as recited in independent claim 38 as an exemplary independent claim) were discussed in detail. Additionally, the distinguishable features of the present invention and the cited prior art were discussed.

For example, it was noted that Fig. 24 of the Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "AAPA") discloses a transmitting apparatus 2510 that includes various combinations of browser storage and a browser pitcher, and content storage and a content pitcher. Additionally, as clearly illustrated in Fig. 24 of AAPA, each combination (i.e., browser storage and a browser pitcher, and content storage and a content pitcher) is provided for processing and outputting either service content or browser content. In other words, the transmitting apparatus 2150 of the AAPA is not capable of processing and outputting the service content and the browser content together prior to being multiplexed. Moreover, it was noted that Dutta fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in the AAPA.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner suggested amending the independent claims to point out that the service content body and the browser content body are stored and outputted as a common content body or entity prior to being processed by a multiplexing device. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment to the claims would help to distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. The Examiner also indicated that further search and/or consideration would be necessary prior to making a final determination regarding the allowability of the claims.

In the final Office Action, claims 38, 39, 42-44, 47-49, and 52-54 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "the AAPA") in view of Dutta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,212, hereafter "Dutta").

Accordingly, the Applicants have amended independent claims 38, 43 and 48 to further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. The amendments made to independent claims 38, 43 and 48 are consistent with the claim amendments suggested by the Examiner during the interview conducted on October 15, 2008.

For example, claim 38 (as amended) recites *inter alia* the following features:

"[a] storage-based broadcasting system which stores a plurality of contents to provide a service and an executable browser used for browsing the service, the system comprising:...

first storage means for storing a service content body and a browser content body, the service content body being for providing the service, and the browser content body being generated from the browser in the same format as the service content body such that the service content body and the browser content body are stored as a common content body or entity," and

"a content body pitcher for outputting the service content body and the browser content body stored in said first storage means as the common content body or entity, ..." (Emphasis added).

The features noted above in independent claim 38 are similarly recited in independent claims 43 and 48. Additionally, the features noted above are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see e.g., Fig. 3, and pg. 20-25).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied primarily on FIG. 24 of the AAPA for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 38, 43 and 48. However, as noted above, independent claims 38, 43 and 48 have been amended to point out that the service content body and the browser content body are stored and outputted as a common content body or entity. As noted during the interview, Fig. 24 of the AAPA merely discloses a transmitting apparatus that include various combinations of browser storage and a browser pitcher, and content storage and a content pitcher, which are not capable of processing (e.g., storing) and outputting service content and browser content together prior to being processed by a multiplexing device.

Moreover, Dutta fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in the AAPA. Dutta merely discloses a proxy server that is connected between a server and a client and is capable of file format conversion.

Based the above discussion, no combination of AAPA and Dutta would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 38, 43 and 48 (as amended). Additionally, no combination of AAPA and Dutta would result in, or otherwise render obvious, dependent claims 39, 42, 44, 47, 49 and 52-54 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

In the Office Action, claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 50 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Dutta, and further in view of Schell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,735, hereafter “Schell”). The Applicants traverse the above rejections for at least the reasons noted below.

Claims 40 and 41 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 38; claims 45 and 46 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 43; and claims 50 and 51 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claim 48. As noted above, AAPA in view of Dutta fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claims 38, 43 and 48. Moreover, after a detailed review of Schell, the reference fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in AAPA and Dutta. Therefore, no combination of AAPA, Dutta and Schell would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 40, 41, 45, 46, 50 and 51 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 38, 43 and 48.

In the light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the final Office Action dated June 30, 2008, and pass this application to issue.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuteru KATAOKA

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2008.10.24 14:38:16 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 24, 2008